

Appl. No. : 10/789,649
Filed : February 27, 2004

REMARKS

The April 7, 2006 Office Action was based on Claims 1-15. The Amendment amends Claims 1, 14, and 15, and adds new Claims 16-20. Thus, after entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-20 are pending and presented for further consideration.

SUMMARY OF OFFICE ACTION

The April 7, 2006 Office Action rejected Claims 1, 7-10, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,794,236 to Merhle ("the Merhle patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,778,972 to Leonardos ("the Leonardos patent"). The Office Action further rejected Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,904 to Ludwig et al. ("the Ludwig patent"). The Office Action further rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and the Ludwig patent and further in view of WIPO Publication No. WO 01/40967 to Elfering ("the Elfering publication"). The Office Action further rejected Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and the Ludwig patent and further in view of Southwest Data, published March 2000 ("the Southwest article"). The Office Action further rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent further in view of Prudential Healthcare, published August 16, 2000 ("the Healthcare article"). The Office Action further rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0041102A1 to Simpson et al. ("the Simpson publication").

THE SPECIFICATION

The present amendment is to inform the Examiner of the related co-pending application, U.S. Application No. 10/970,438. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being introduced by way of this Amendment and requests that the foregoing Amendment to the specification be entered and made of record.

Appl. No. : 10/789,649
Filed : February 27, 2004

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 7-10, 14 AND 15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The April 7, 2006 Office Action rejected Claims 1, 7-10, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent.

Claim 1

While Merhle and Leonardos appear to teach an organization structure for documents, neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, teach a software utility, such as a wizard, to generate a document generation management process. See Figure 3 and paragraph 45. Neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, disclose importing within a software utility one or more documents in electronic form, designating within the software utility an organizational structure including main categories and one or more levels of subcategories, and assigning within the software utility the one or more documents to one or more of the main categories and subcategories within the organizational structure. Further, neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, disclose a software utility which automatically generates a document management system including one or more documents organized within the organizational structure and accessible via a computing system.

In contrast, an embodiment of the present disclosure imports within a software utility one or more documents in electronic form, designates within the software utility an organizational structure including main categories and one or more levels of subcategories, and assigns within the software utility the one or more documents to one or more of the main categories and subcategories within the organizational structure. In addition, in an embodiment, a software utility automatically generates a document management system including one or more documents organized within the organizational structure and accessible via a computing system.

Because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach or suggest importing within a software utility one or more documents in electronic form, designating within the software utility or wizard an organizational structure including main categories and one or more levels of subcategories, and assigning within the software utility the

Appl. No. : 10/789,649
Filed : February 27, 2004

one or more documents to one or more of the main categories and subcategories within the organizational structure, and because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach or suggest a software utility which automatically generates a document management system including one or more documents organized within the organizational structure and accessible via a computing system, Applicants assert that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Merhle and Leonardos, alone or in combination. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over the cited references and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 1.

Claim 14

While Merhle and Leonardos appear to teach an organization structure for documents, neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, teach a software utility, such as a wizard, to generate a document generation management process. See Figure 3 and paragraph 45. Neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, disclose associating within a software wizard electronic documents within an organization structure designated by a user, where the organizational structure includes main categories and one or more levels of subcategories. Further, neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, disclose the software wizard which automatically generates a website indexing the electronic documents within the organization structure. Further yet, neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, disclose modifying one of the electronic documents using a user interface after the website is generated, and republishing the website to reflect the modified electronic document.

In contrast, an embodiment of the present disclosure associates within a software wizard electronic documents within an organization structure designated by a user, where the organizational structure includes main categories and one or more levels of subcategories. Further, the software wizard thereby automatically generates a website indexing the electronic documents within the organization structure. Further yet, an embodiment modifies one of the electronic documents using a user interface after the website is generated, and republishes the website to reflect the modified electronic

Appl. No. : 10/789,649
Filed : February 27, 2004

document. The embodiment republishes the modified document in addition to the unmodified documents to reflect the modified electronic document.

Because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach or suggest associating within a software wizard electronic documents within an organization structure designated by a user, where the organizational structure includes main categories and one or more levels of subcategories, because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose the software wizard which automatically generates a website indexing the electronic documents within the organization structure, and because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose modifying one of the electronic documents using a user interface after the website is generated, and republishing the website to reflect the modified electronic document, Applicant asserts that Claim 14 is not obvious in view of the Merhle and Leonardos, alone or in combination. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 14 is patentably distinguished over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claim 14.

Claim 8

Neither Merhle nor Leonardos, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the use of a management system that comprises a CD-ROM and is accessible via a computer.

In contrast, an embodiment of the present disclosure of the management system comprises a CD-ROM and is accessible via a computer. This provides an archival copy of the document management system, which can be important in certain industries, such as healthcare and construction. In addition, not all industries, such as a small construction subcontractor, for example, are web enabled. In an embodiment, the CD-ROM may provide such industries with a fully self-contained distributable functional document management system.

Claim 8, which depends from Claim 1, is believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 1, and because of the additional features recited therein. Further, because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach or suggest an embodiment of the management system comprising a

Appl. No. : 10/789,649
Filed : February 27, 2004

CD-ROM and is accessible via a computer, Applicants assert that Claim 8 is not obvious in view of Merhle and Leonardos, alone or in combination. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 8 is patentably distinguished over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claim 8.

Claims 7, 9-10 and 15

Claims 7, 9-10, which depend from Claim 1, and Claim 15, which depends from Claim 14, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 1 and 14, respectively, and because of the additional features recited therein.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2-6 and 11-13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and in further view of the Ludwig patent. The Office Action rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and the Ludwig patent and further in view of the Elfering publication. The Office Action rejected Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and the Ludwig patent and further in view of the Southwest article. The Office Action further rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and further in view of the Healthcare article. The Office Action further rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Merhle patent in view of the Leonardos patent and further in view of the Simpson publication.

Claims 2-6 and 11-13

Claims 2-6 and 11-13, which depend from Claim 1, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 1, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Appl. No. : 10/789,649
Filed : February 27, 2004

NEW CLAIMS 16-20

New Claims 16-20 have been added to more fully define the Applicant's invention and are believed to be fully distinguished over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved. Also, please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 7, 2006

By: 

John M. Grover
Registration No. 42,610
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

2665147
060706